

REMARKS

The Office Action dated May 6, 2008 has been carefully considered. Claims 1-20 are currently pending in the application. Applicant has amended claims 1-20. No new matter has been added by these amendments. All claims are indicated as allowable. Entry of the aforementioned amendments and reconsideration of the pending claims is requested.

The Examiner has objected to claims 1-20 stating that "has" in claim 1, lines 7 and 8 should be changed to "have". The examiner also stated that "Claim" in the dependent claims should not be capitalized. In response, Applicant has amended claims 1-20 to correct the stated informalities.

Claims 1-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner stated there is no proper antecedent basis for claim 1, line 4 "the peripheral insert". Claim 1 has been amended and now recites "the peripheral inserts" which has the antecedent basis in line 2. Similarly, the Examiner stated "the abutting surfaces" in claim 2, line 1 does not have a proper antecedent basis. Claim 2 has been amended and now recites " abutting surfaces of the abutting part" which has the antecedent basis in claim 1, lines 8-9. Further, the Examiner stated that there is no proper antecedent basis for "said insert" of claims 6, 12-20. Claims 6, 12-20 have been amended to recite "said peripheral inserts", the antecedent of which is found in the independent claim 1, line 2. Claims 1-20 have been further amended for other similar corrections.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance in view of these amendments. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the stated objection and rejection, and issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Application is considered in good and proper form for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

In re Appln. Of: Leon Leclercq
Application No.: 10/591,030

Extension of Time and Fee Deficiency

Applicant believes that no extension of time is required. However, this conditional petition is being made to provide for the possibility that Applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for a petition and fee for extension of time. If any additional fee is required, or any overpayment is made, in connection with this communication please charge or credit deposit account No. 50-3505.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sun Y. Pae/

Sun Y. Pae, Reg. No. 61401
Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren P.C.
2215 Perrygreen Way
Rockford, Illinois 61107
(815) 633-5300 (telephone)
(815) 654-5770 (facsimile)

Date: May 22, 2008